## REMARKS

In accordance with Applicant's duty to provide a summary of an interview, Applicant submits that an interview occurred on October 29, 2007, and Applicant's representative and Examiner Bell participated in that interview. Applicant would like to thank Examiner Bell for the courtesies extended during that interview. Applicant proposed some claim amendments, such as those contained herein, and the Examiner agreed that these proposed claim amendments appear to overcome the rejection of record. Applicant also discussed claims 39 and 40, which were previously withdrawn by the Examiner due to a restriction requirement. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the restriction of these claims. Applicant cancels claims 39 and 40 in this Amendment and reintroduces them as new claims 42 and 43. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's reconsideration of these claims.

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner reiterated the prior restriction requirement; rejected claims 1, 2, and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bowman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,006,225); rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bowman et al. in view of Korda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,210); and rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bowman et al. in view of Fries et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,460,029).

By this Amendment, Applicant cancels claims 10, 27-37, and 39-41 without prejudice or disclaimer, amends claims 1, 2, 12, 13, and 38 to improve form, and adds new claims 42-51. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 with regard to the claims presented herein. Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 11-13, 38, and 42-51 are pending.

*RESTRICTION*

At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner reiterated a prior restriction requirement and withdrew claims 27-37 and 39-41 from further consideration. As explained above, claims 40 and 41 have been canceled herein and reintroduced as new claims 42 and 43. Claims 42 and 43 recite features similar to features recited in the other independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that these new claims be examined along with the other pending claims.

*REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON BOWMAN ET AL.*

At pages 2-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1, 2, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bowman et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method that comprises receiving a search query; determining whether the received search query includes an entity name corresponding to a particular entity; determining whether to rewrite the received search query based on information relating to prior searches involving the entity name; rewriting the received search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with the particular entity when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on the information relating to the prior searches; automatically performing a search of the domain associated with the particular entity based on the rewritten search query to obtain search results; and presenting the search results.

Bowman et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in amended claim 1. For example, Bowman et al. does not disclose or suggest rewriting a received

search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on information relating to prior searches involving an entity name corresponding to the particular entity.

Instead, Bowman et al. discloses a search refinement system that identifies terms related to terms in a search query based on the frequencies with which specific terms have historically been submitted together within the same query (col. 2, lines 28-37). Bowman et al. discloses the related terms are presented as links along with the search results based on the search query (Fig. 9; col. 7, lines 27-30; col. 14, lines 13-23). Bowman et al. discloses nothing similar to a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity, let alone rewriting a received search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on information relating to prior searches involving an entity name corresponding to the particular entity, as recited in claim 1.

Because Bowman et al. does not disclose or suggest rewriting a received search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity, Bowman et al. cannot disclose or suggest automatically performing a search of the domain associated with the particular entity based on the rewritten search query to obtain search results.

In the interview of October 29, 2007, the Examiner agreed that Bowman et al. does not appear to disclose or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over Bowman et al. Claims 2 and 11 depend from claim 1 and are, therefore, patentable over Bowman et al. for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Amended independent claims 12 and 13 recite features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 are, therefore, patentable over Bowman et al. for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Bowman be reconsidered and withdrawn.

*REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON BOWMAN ET AL. AND KORDA ET AL.*

At pages 5-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bowman et al. in view of Korda et al. Applicant traverses the rejection.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the Examiner's rejection of claims 7-9, Applicant submits that the disclosure of Korda et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosure of Bowman et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. For example, Korda et al. does not disclose or suggest rewriting a received search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on information relating to prior searches involving an entity name corresponding to the particular entity, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Korda et al. discloses that if a user frequently selects documents from a particular domain, a suggestion can be given for future queries to restrict these queries to that domain (col. 11, lines 15-22).

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above and with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 7-9 are patentable over Bowman et al. and Korda et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7-9 under 35

U.S.C. § 103 based on Bowman et al. and Korda et al. be reconsidered and withdrawn.

*REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 BASED ON BOWMAN ET AL. AND FRIES ET AL.*

At pages 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Bowman et al. in view of Fries et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended independent claim 38 recites features similar to, yet possibly different in scope from, features recited in claim 1. The disclosure of Fries et al. does not cure the deficiencies in the disclosure of Bowman et al. identified above with regard to claim 1. For example, Fries et al. does not disclose or suggest rewriting a received search query to include a restrict identifier relating to a domain associated with a particular entity when it is determined that the received search query should be rewritten based on information relating to prior searches involving an entity name corresponding to the particular entity, as recited in claim 1. Instead, Fries et al. discloses a web companion that interacts with a user to provide searching options to the user based on the search query and previous searching options that the user has selected (col. 5, lines 30-36).

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above and with regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 38 is patentable over Bowman et al. and Fries et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on Bowman et al. and Fries et al.

*NEW CLAIMS*

New independent claims 42 and 43 recite features similar to, yet possibly different in

scope from, features recited in claim 1. Claims 42 and 43 are, therefore, patentable over the applied references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least reasons similar to reasons given with regard to claim 1.

New claims 44-49 depend from claim 13. Claims 44-49 are, therefore, patentable over the applied references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 13.

New claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 1. Claims 50 and 51 are, therefore, patentable over the applied references, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given with regard to claim 1.

*CONCLUSION*

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections overcome the rejections, Applicant's silence as to certain assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or that such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to dispute these assertions/requirements in the future.

If the Examiner believes that the application is not now in condition for allowance, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned to discuss any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 35 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER LLP

By: /Paul A. Harrity, Reg No 39574/
Paul A. Harrity
Reg. No. 39,574

Date: November 23, 2007

11350 RANDOM HILLS ROAD
SUITE 600
FAIRFAX, VIRGINIA 22030
TELEPHONE: 571-432-0800
FACSIMILE: 571-432-0808